THE

Oxford-Antiquity

EXAMINED:

WHEREIN

Is briefly ſhewn the Notorious Falſhoods in the *Greek* Manuſcript, ſaid to be Tranſlated by *Humphry Hody*, B. D. of *Wadham* College, *Oxon.* Which the better to recommend to the World, he Entitles, *The Unreaſonableneſs of a Separation from the New Biſhops*, &c.

LONDON,

Printed in the Year M DC XCI.

DAVIDS LIBRARY COLLEGE

THE

Oxford Antiquity

EXAMINED:

WHEREIN

Is briefly shewn the Notorious Falshoods in the *Greek* Manuscript, said to be Translated by *Humphry Hody*, B. D. of *Wadham* College, *Oxon.* Which the better to recommend to the World, he Entitles, *The Unreasonableness of a Separation from the New Bishops*, &c.

LONDON,

Printed in the Year MDCXCI.

THE Oxford-Antiquity EXAMINED.

THE Authour of the Pamphlet, entituled, *The Unreasonableness of a Separation from the New Bishops*, &c. would have the World take notice what a *fortuitous Hit*, or rather *singular Providence* it is, that the *Greek Manuscript*, of which he is the lucky Translator, should lie so long unregarded *in the publick Library at* Oxford, (none hitherto having Brains or Sagacity enough to discern and discover the worth of it,) and *at this very Juncture be taken notice of, and so opportunely be brought to Light* by this diligent and zealous Searcher into Antiquity. Who very gravely and charitably prays, That *it may have that good Effect upon those dissatisfied Persons of the Church of* England, *which so many Examples and Authorities of Antiquity may give* him *reason to expect*. And could it boast as much *Truth* as *Antiquity*, I know not what it might doe.

But, it seems, *there is no name prefixt before it*; which I the less wonder at, for the Authour pleading for Injustice, and the Succession of Usurping Bishops in the Sees of those who he confesses were unjustly deprived, and being an Assistant (as his Translator thinks) at the Consecration of the Usurper, and therefore so vehemently pressing Obedience to, and Communion with him, thought fit, perhaps, (being ashamed of it) to conceal his Name; to which therefore, being of no great Credit and Authority, it cannot be expected that those *unsatisfied Persons of the Church of* England (as he calls them) should pay any greater Respect or Veneration, merely because he can write Greek, than to the Confident Pamphletier, because he can translate it.

But though the Authority is *Anonymous*, yet the Translator has taken effectual Care to discover his own *Name*, (which not onely the Title Page of his Book, but the *Gazette* too, must publish to the World,) making a reverend Leg to the New A. B. bespeaking the next Preferment that falls in his Gift, (for though the Authour did not, like a Time-server, court or write for Preferment, yet I hope his Translator may,) for which he may as readily expect the *Archiepiscopal Fiat*, as the pert, supercilious *Chaplain's Imprimatur*: In hopes and prospect of which he will give his Word, or if you please his Oath, not to be guilty of a *Separation from the new Bishops*.

But perhaps it will be ſaid, 'tis no matter for the Author's *Name*, provided that what he ſpeaks is true, and *may be made out* (as the Tranſlator ſays it eaſily can) *from approved and authentick Hiſtorians.*

Now that my Reader may the better judge of this, I will give him a Taſte or too of the *Truth* of his Book, in a few Obſervations upon ſome remarkable Paſſages in it.

And for the Authorities which I quote, that the moſt unlearned Reader may not be at a loſs, or puzzled, by ſending him to the Greek Hiſtorians, as *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret*, *Zonaras*, &c. I ſhall only refer him to an *Engliſh Hiſtorian*, of good Credit and Authority, who has taken the great and worthy Pains to write the Lives of the Fathers, making his Collections out of approved and Authentick Hiſtorians, referring the curious learned Reader to the Book, Chapter, and Page, out of which, as Occaſion offers, I muſt beg leave to tranſcribe ſome remarkable Paſſages, which may not be unacceptable to the Reader who has not the Book.

Dr. Cave.

And here firſt of all I cannot but obſerve what a *learned Hiſtorian*, and *exact Chronologer*, the Author of the *Greek Manuſcript*, or his Tranſlatour, is, (for I cannot well tell, not having ſeen the Greek Manuſcript, to which the Abſtract *(pag.* 23.) is to be attributed,) who tells his Reader, *(pag.* 24.) *That in the Reign of* Conſtantine *the Great*, Maximus *Biſhop of* Jeruſalem *was depoſed by the Biſhop of* Cæſarea *in* Paleſtine; *his Succeſſor was* Cyril. Now 'tis notorious that St. *Cyril* was not made Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, till 12 or 14 Years after the Death of *Conſtantine the Great*, who dyed at *Nicomedia*, [a] *Anno Chriſti* 337. And St. *Cyril* entred upon the See of *Jeruſalem* (not upon the Depoſition, but the Death of *Maximus*, as I ſhall ſhew by and by,) [b] *Anno Chriſti* 349. according to Saint *Jerom*; *Anno* 351. according to *Baronius*'s Computation.

[a] *Vide* Cave's *Lives of the Fathers*, vol. 2. p. 94.

And [c] *Acacius*, Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine*, (who he ſays depoſed *Maximus*,) ſucceeded *Euſebius* (whoſe Scholar he was) in that See, [b] *Anno* 340. which was three years after the Death of *Conſtantine the Great*. So that what the Greek Author, or his Tranſlator, affirms in the *Abſtract* before mentioned, I know not whether I may call a *Horrid Blunder*, or an *Impudent and notorious Lye.*

[b] *Ib. p.* 343.

[c] *Woo is mention'd by Name, p.* 8. *which I deſire the Reader to take notice of, leſt the Tranſlator, to excuſe the Inconſiſtency in the Abſtract, ſhould pretend that 'twas another Biſhop of* Cæſarea.

[a] Cave's *Lives*, *Vol.* 2. *p.* 28.

But let us look into the Body of the Manuſcript, and ſee what Prints and Footſteps of *Truth* we can find and trace out there.

And firſt of all, though he begins with an Account of St. *Chryſoſtom*, I ſhall rather chuſe to examine what he ſays *(p.* 9.) is *delivered in the Life of the Great* Athanaſius, who was before St. *Chryſoſtom*. He tells us, *(p.* 8.) That *Athanaſius* being *condemned* and *depoſed* by the *Synod* at Tyre, fled to *Maximus* at *Jeruſalem*, who thereupon, he ſays, called a *Private Synod*, and *repealed what was done by the* Synod *of* Tyre *againſt* Athanaſius, and *reſtored him to his See*; which is very falſe, as to matter

of

of Fact: For *Athanasius* being condemned and deposed by the Synod at *Tyre*, (where [f] *Maximus* himself was prevailed with to subscribe the Deposition, and therefore 'twas unlikely that *Athanasius* would fly to him,) "finding the Malice of his Enemies inflexible, ([h] to use the words of Dr. *Cave*, who takes his Account from [i] *Athanasius* himself.) "upon his Retreat from *Tyre*, made his Address at Court, where he "met the Emperour on Horse-back entring into *Constantinople*, where "after several unsuccessfull Addresses he took the Confidence freely to "tell him, [k] That he desired no more than that he would not suffer "him to be ruined by Malice and Violence, that his Cause might be "debated in a lawful and impartial Synod, at least that his Judges at "*Tyre* might be brought Face to Face, and he have the Liberty to ex-"hibit his Complaints against them: Which the Emperour looking "upon as a piece of Common Justice, dispatched away a Letter to the "Synod at *Jerusalem*, (whither he had [l] adjourned the Synod at *Tyre*,) "commanding those of them that had acted in the Council of *Tyre* to "appear before him, and give an Account of their Proceedings therein "against *Athanasius*. Who upon a new [m] Accusation by *Eusebius*, and others, (who came to *Constantinople*,) touching the *Corn-Fleet*, (which nearly concerned the *Imperial Rights*, of which the *Emperour* was jealous, as Princes usualy are, and therefore apter to believe the Story,) was by the Emperour's Order banished to *Triers*: From whence he returned after the Death of *Constantine*, by the younger *Constantine's* [n] Order, and was restored and joyfully received at *Alexandria*, *Anno* 337. But in a little time, his Enemies making an Interest against him with [p] *Constantius*, to whose share the Eastern part of the Empire fell, a Synod was held at [r] *Antioch*, (where *Maximus*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, repented of what he had done at *Tyre*, refused to appear,) where they revived old matters against him, and [s] deposed him, and put *Gregory* in his Room; upon which *Athanasius* fled to [t] *Rome*, where *Julius*, Bishop there, convened a Synod, summoning the Bishops in the Synod at *Antioch*, that acted against *Athanasius* to appear as Plaintiffs against him, who not appearing, the Synod absolved him. After that a Council was held by the Imperial Order (*Constantius* consenting to the Motion and Request of his Brother *Constans*,) at [u] *Sardica*, *Anno* 347. where *Athanasius* was absolved and [w] restored, and sent to *Alexandria* with Honour by [x] *Constantius*. In his Journey thither he made a Visit to [y] *Maximus*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who assembled a Synod of Neighbour Bishops, and they unanimously received him to Communion, and wrot in his Behalf to the Bishops of *Egypt*. But 'tis absurd and ridiculous to suppose what our *Greek Author* affirms, that they, being onely a private Synod or Convention, would undertake or presume to repeal what was done by the Synod of *Tyre* against *Athanasius*, or judicially restore him to his See; which indeed was needless, it being already done by the Council of *Sardica*.

[f] *Ibid.* p. 100.
[h] *Ibid.* p. 89.
[i] Ath. *Apol.* 11. p. 568.
[k] p. 90.
[l] *Ibid.* p. 89. S. 9.
[m] *Ib.* p. 90.
[n] *Ib.* p. 96, & 97.
[p] p. 98.
[r] p. 100.
[s] p. 102.
[t] p. 103, 104.
[u] p. 109.
[w] p. 115. *Sect.* 8.
[x] p. 121, 123, 124.
[y] p. 123. *Sect.* 6.

And as untrue it is what he affirms (*p.* 8.) touching St. *Cyril*; who was promoted to the See of *Jerusalem*, not upon the Depositon, but the Death of *Maximus*, if we will believe [z] St. *Jerom* and *Theodoret*.

[z] p. 342.

More-

Moreover, it is not likely that St. *Cyril* would ſupplant *Maximus*, who
* *p.* 341. was his Spiritual Father, from whom he received his * Ordination of Presbyter, exerciſing the Office of Catechiſt under him. And much more improbable is it that he would renounce it, in Compliance with *Acacius* and the Arian Party, of which our *Greek Author* ſays, (*p.* 9) *St.* Cyril *was the chief; but afterwards becoming a Convert to the Homoouſian (or Orthodox Faith) he was willingly received and allowed as Patriarch by the Church.* Which charge againſt him (to uſe Dr. *Cave's*
p. 342. Words) is certainly built upon Ignorance or Miſtake. " For, as the " Doctor ſays, were there nothing elſe, 'tis enough that he is vindica- " ted by the Depoſition of thoſe, who were as capable to know the " true State of Things, as St. *Jerom*, or any of the reſt. *Theodoret* " ſpeaking of his entring upon the See of *Jeruſalem*, ſays, *He was a* " *moſt ſtout and vigorous Defender of the Apoſtolick Doctrine*; and the " Fathers of the great Council at *Conſtantinople*, in their Synodical " Letter to Pope *Damaſus*, Style him *the moſt Reverend, and moſt* " *Religious Biſhop* Cyril, and aſſure us that he had been Rightly and " Canonically Ordained by the Biſhops of that Province, and had in " ſeveral places ſuffered many very hard Things from the Arian Party. " Than which, ſays he, what could have been ſpoken more plain and " pertinent in his Juſtification? One ſuch authentick and unqueſti- " onable Teſtimony, given by ſo many, and ſuch venerable Perſons, " all Catholick Biſhops, who lived at the ſame time, and could not be " Ignorant of his Affairs, who had then his Company with them, and " his Cauſe before them, weighs more with me, ſays the Doctor, (and " truly ſo it does with me too,) than an hundred Reports (like our " *Greek Author's*) taken up at ſecond Hand, and at a Peradventure by " Perſons at a diſtance, who neither accounted it their Intereſt, nor " made it their Buſineſs nicely to enquire into Things, whether they " were true or falſe.

In the next place, let us examine what our *Greek Author* ſays touching St. *Chryſoſtom*, and the Anti-Biſhops, which were moſt unjuſtly ſet up in his room.

St. *Chryſoſtom*, the Metropolitan Biſhop of the Imperial See of *Conſtantinople*, he confeſſes (*p.* 2.) *was unjuſtly depoſed, and thruſt out of the City: And after him*, he ſays, *there was Conſecrated* Arſacius, *who*, he ſays, *held the Patriarchate* 14 *Months* (‡ 15 Months and ſome odd
‡ *Ibid.* *p.* 517. Days, ſays *Socrates*) *and, as cannot but be ſuppoſed, Ordained Preſbyters, Biſhops, and Deacons; none of whom were rejected by the Church. After his Death*, he ſays, *the bleſſed* Atticus *was Conſecrated*, Chryſoſtom *being yet alive and in Exile. He raiſed a Perſecution againſt thoſe that adhered to* Chryſoſtom, *&c.* And then ſums up the Succeſſion after the depoſing St. *Chryſoſtom*, which he intimates was generally approved by the Church, *p.* 4. *See now*, ſays he, *the Succeſſion. They that depoſed* Chryſoſtom, *conſecrated* Arſacius; *the ſame, together with* Arſacius, ‡*conſecrated* Atticus; Arſacius *and* Atticus, Siſinnius; *and* Siſinnius Proclus, *who*, he ſays, *were received into Communion by St.* Cyril.

‡ *How could Arſacius conſecrate Atticus?*

Whereas St. *Cyril* was dead 12 Years before the Conſecration of St.

St. *Chrysostom*, who was consecrated and inthroned at *Antioch*, * *Anno* *secrate* At-
Christi 398. and St. *Cyril* dyed ‡ *Anno* 386. Another *Blunder*, or ticus *and*
rather *Falshood*, of our acurate Historian's. Sisinnius,
unless by
the Necromantick Art, (in which perhaps our Greek Author was skill'd) he was raised from the dead. Which Absurdity the Translator being sensible of, endeavours to help it by a forced and false Interpretation of the Greek Words, which he recites in the Margent, (pag. 4.) *whereas the word* χειροτονίαι *cannot possibly signifie (as the Translator would have it, and that contrary to his own Version in the body of his Book,)* those consecrated by *Arsacius*, &c. * *Ibid. p* 464. ‡ *p.* 356.

But to let that pass; that which I would observe is what our Author does insinuate; *viz.* the peaceable and ready Compliance and Communion of the Church with, and acquiescence and satisfaction in those usurping Bishops, who succeeded the deposed *Chrysostom*. The Truth of which I shall particularly examine by and by. In the mean time I must beg leave to remark, that though the *Translator* in his Preface (or some Body else for him, if 'tis a third Person under the Characters of *R. B.* at the End of it) does affirm, with Forehead enough, in Compliance with his *Greek Author*, That *in the Cases of unjust Deprivation and uncanonical Succession a Separation is without Example in Ecclesiastical Story*; yet he allows of the *Exception of St.* Chrysostom's *Case*. He might have added, and that justly, the Case of St. *Athanasius*, if he had pleased, the Bishops, and Clergy, and People of the Metropolitical See of *Alexandria* generally separating from, and refusing Communion with his intruding Successors; and resolutely owning and acknowledging *Athanasius* to be their onely lawfull Bishop, (which yet was canonicallly though unjustly deposed,) notwithstanding the Threatnings and furious Persecutions which they underwent for their constant Adherence to him. And if he was still their lawfull Bishop, then on supposition that an orthodox Bishop had been placed in his Chair, (the *Greek Authour's Hypothesis*, and the great Argument of his Book,) it could no more have altered the Case, or justified Communion with the Usurper, than the setting up an *Heretical* Bishop, because both the one and the other were to be consider'd, not as *orthodox* or *heretical*, but *anti-bishops*, and *schismatically* set up against him; but he only allows of *the Exception of St.* Chrysostom's *Case*, and we are beholden to him for that, though indeed I do not well see how he could avoid it; for if he had not made the Exception himself, there are enough that would have been ready to have made it for him, whom he thought necessary to prevent, being perhaps put to the blush by his celebrated *Greek Authour's* bold Assertion, whom every common Reader of Ecclesiastical History could contradict and give the Lye to. But then he minces the matter, and shuffles it off, by telling his Reader, that the Separation was only in the *Western Churches*, and amongst the *Rabble* at *Constantinople*, who, he says, were so *enraged, that they not onely forsook but set fire to the Church*; so *Chrysostom's* Adversaries, indeed without any Scruple, reported, charging it upon his Party, as the Effect of an insatiable Revenge, while some

Who

Ibid. p. 501.

'ſome more calmly conſidering the unaccountable Riſe, (breaking out 'under the Pulpit,) the ſtrange Progreſs and Manner of the Conflagra-'tion, conceived it ſent from Heaven, to puniſh the Enormities of that 'Time, and the unjuſt Baniſhment of ſo uſefull and excellent a Paſtor, 'and ſo entirely beloved by his People. But he tells ye, that 'twas other-wiſe amongſt the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, who, he ſays, *though they would not be acceſſory to that unjuſt Deprivation, however were not ſo far tranſported as to make a Schiſm in the Church.* But that Weſtern *Separation* or *renouncing Communion* (which he repreſents by the extenuating, ſoftening Name of being *onely as it were a breaking off a Correſpondence*) he tells ye *was contrary to the Spirit of St.* Chryſoſtom; *who*, he ſays, *when he ſaw he muſt be depoſed, adviſed and charged the Biſhops his Friends, more than once, That as they loved Chriſt, none of them ſhould leave his Church upon his account, That they muſt keep Communion with his Depoſers, and not rend and divide the Church*; and *enjoined ſome devout Women that attended there, That as they hoped to obtain Mercy from God, they ſhould pay the ſame Service and Good-Will to his Succeſſor by a fair Election, that they had done to himſelf; for the Church could not be without a Biſhop.*

And here to kill two Birds with one Stone, I will at once anſwer both the *Prefacer* and his *Author*, by repreſenting Matter of Fact from undoubted and undeniable Teſtimony.

The Deprivation of that great and good Man, St. *Chryſoſtom*, was grievouſly reſented by the generality of Chriſtians, both *Clergy* and *Laity*, who to expreſs their Abhorrence of the Proceeding againſt him, refuſed to own or communicate with *Arſacius*, his uſurping and intruding Succeſſor, declaring that *Chryſoſtom* was ſtill their lawfull Biſhop, and uncanonically depoſed and thruſt out of his See: For though the Proceedings againſt him at *Chalcedon*, in the Synod at the *Oak* by *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and the reſt of his Gang, (though what was done was highly unjuſt,) might carry a fair and plauſible Shew and Appearance of a Depoſition, (from which he was abſolved by a Synod of Biſhops, above 60 in number, who met at *Conſtantinople* by the Emperour's Order, and took the Proceedings of the former Synod under a Review, revers'd the Acts of it, and entirely reſtored *Chryſoſtom* to his See;) yet his Depoſition, or Deprivation afterwards by a * Warrant from the Emperor (which might truly be called a *State Deprivation*, and ſo has ſome Affinity with the Caſe of our deprived Engliſh Biſhops) was altogether uncanonical, and conſequently unjuſt and unlawful. And ſo it was generally eſteemed to be; for when † *Arſacius* was clapt into the Chair a Week after *Chryſoſtom's* Departure into Baniſhment, (the See of *Conſtantinople* being made vacant, according to their Notion of Vacancy,) *Chryſoſtom's* Friends and followers (which were not a few, both of the Clergy and Laity) not enduring to behold an Uſurper in his Throne, 'ſeparated from him, and rejected all Communion with him, keeping 'their Religious Aſſemblies in ſeveral out-parts of the City; and from their

Ibid. p. 482, & 487.

* *An impracticable and unpreſidented Thing, which the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches highly blam'd and condemn'd the Emperour for, who did it merely to gratifie the Importunities of Malice and Revenge.*

† p. 502.

their constant Adherence to *John* their Bishop, were by an appro-
priate Title called *Joannites*. It vext old *Arsacius*, says the Historian, *Ibid.*
to be thus slighted, and to find so considerable a part of the People
turn their backs upon him (the Churches being in a manner empty,
and the Fields and private Meetings, where they paid their Devotions,
and assembled for Religious Exercises, crowded with *Chrysostom's*
Friends) of which he complained to the Emperor, who presently pub-
lished severe Edicts, commanding all Masters to restrain their Servants
from going to those Conventicles, under certain Penalties, which were *Ibid.*
likewise to be inflicted on all Citizens that were found tardy herein;
i. e. that did frequent those Conventicles, and refuse Communion with
Arsacius. And that my Reader may not think that 'twas only the *Lasty*,
or the *Rabble* at *Constantinople* (to use the Words of the Preface) that
separated from, and refused Communion with this New Bishop of *Con-*
stantinople; I will recite an impartial Edict (procured no doubt by *Ar-*
sacius and his Party) which was ordered to be transmitted to the Go-
vernours of Provinces to suppress those unlawful Conventicles, (as
they called them) viz. *Whosoever does not communicate with* Theo- *Ibid. p.* 503.
philus, Arsacius, *and* Porphyrius, *let him be deposed from his Bishoprick;*
and withall let him forfeit whatever Estate he has either in Money or
Land. Which, says the Historian, being particularly restrained to
Bishops, was soon after followed with another of a more general Ex-
tent: viz. *Whosoever shall conceal a Bishop or a Clergy man, or so much*
as entertain in his House any one that communicates with Chrysostom,
let his House be forfeited, and exposed to sale. Which Laws, says the
Historian, wanted a quick and sharp Execution: Of which he gives
many lamentable Instances. Notwithstanding which severity the Bishops
and Clergy, and amongst the rest *Innocent* Bishop of *Rome*, and most of *Ibid. p.* 506,
the *Western* Bishops, as well as the People, held Communion with *Chry-* 507.
sostom, and protested against *Arsacius*, and all Communion with him.

Nor did the Separation end with *Arsacius*, who dyed *Anno* 405 but *Ibid. p.* 517.
continued as high and violent against his Successor *Atticus*, a profest E-
my to *Chrysostom*, having been one of his prime Accusers in the Synod
at the *Oak*, yea, πάσης μηχανῆς τέκτων as *Palladius* styles him, the Man
that had contrived and layd the Plot and Design against him. Which
perhaps, says the Historian, was one of the best Qualifications that
recommended him to his place: Which, says he, he was no sooner
possessed of, but he endeavoured to reduce the *Joannites* to a Com- *Ibid.*
pliance with him. But finding that not only the Bishops, but the
People generally stood at a distance from him, he fled to the usual
Refuge in such Cases, the Secular Arm, and knowing that if the Bi-
shops were once brought in the People would follow of course, he first
pronounced the following Edict: *If any Bishop do not communicate* *Ibid. p.* 518.
with Theophilus, Porphyry, *and* Atticus, *let him be deposed from his*
See, and deprived of all his Estate. And to strike a Terror in all sorts
of Persons, says the same Author, and that the Laity might not think
themselves exempted, another Edict was published, commanding that
Persons of Place and Dignity, should forfeit their Honours and Offices,
Commanders and Souldiers be cashiered, Trades-men and common

 People

Ibid. "People fined in conſiderable Summs, and baniſhed. To prevent the "ſeverity of theſe Laws, ſome that were Rich complied to ſave their "Eſtates, others that were Poor, or that ſaw not far into the ſtate of "Things, were by large Promiſes drawn into Communion with him. "But the far greateſt part ſtood off, and preferred the Goodneſs of their "Cauſe before Riches or Honour, Kindred or Country, and choſe ra-"ther to fly to the Mountains, or to hide themſelves in the remoteſt Mo-"naſteries, or to betake themſelves into Foreign Parts; and thoſe that "did ſtay were forced to aſſemble in the Fields, and to offer up their De-"votions under the open Canopy of Heaven. Nor was it only the *Weſtern* Biſhops, (as the *Preſacer* falſſely affirms,) but the *Eaſtern* Biſhops too generally refuſed Communion with the uſurping Biſhops at *Conſtantinople*, and held Communion with *Chryſoſtom*, whom they eſteemed the only lawful Biſhop of that *See*.

And for this I will likewiſe refer my Reader to the aforeſaid *Hiſtorian*, who takes this Account from *Palladius*, c. 18. p. 194.

Ib. p. 518. "Nor, ſays he, was it thus at *Conſtantinople*, but almoſt in all other "places of the *Eaſt*, where ſeveral Biſhops were baniſhed into the moſt "barbarous Countries, and kept in common Gaols; of whom he gives a large Catalogue, with an Account of their barbarous Uſage, in that and the following pages, which I deſire my Reader to peruſe at his leiſure.

But this Separation, ſays the *Preſacer*, was contrary to the Spirit of St. *Chryſoſtom*, which he infers from his Advice to the Biſhops, his Friends, *That none of them ſhould leave his Church upon his Account, but they muſt keep Communion with his Depoſers*, and his charge to the devout Women, *That they ſhould pay the ſame Service and good will to his Succeſſor, that they had done to himſelf.*

'Tis true that good Man did thus adviſe his Friends, and that out of a tender regard to them, ſeeing a fierce and dreadful ſtorm of Perſecution ariſing, which he was loth they ſhould for his ſake be expoſed to. Thus our *bleſſed Saviour* paſſionately adviſed and charged the devout Women that followed him, *Daughters of Jeruſalem, weep not for me*—— But he did not ſlight or diſregard their Tears, but put them into his Bottle, accepting and rewarding them as grateful Sacrifice, a *Sweet-ſmelling Savour*. And though St. *Chryſoſtom* beforehand adviſed againſt, yet he did not afterwards diſlike, or quarrel with thoſe Sufferings, which his Friends underwent for his ſake, nor chide or reprehend them for their Separation from, or renouncing Communion with his uſurping Succeſſors and their Brethren, (whom Dr. *Cave*, or his Author, Styles the *Schiſmatical* Biſhops at *Conſtantinople*, preſuming that they are the *Ib. p.* 515. *Schiſmaticks* which make the *Schiſm*, and therein acquitting the *Joannite* Separatiſts from that Charge,) which was the Cauſe, the Source and Spring of all their Troubles and Afflictions.

And for this I will refer my Reader to the aforeſaid Hiſtorian, who giving an Account of Letters which St. *Chryſoſtom* wrote to his Friends in his Baniſhment, ſays, 'But above all others he thought it neceſſary "for him to write to the Biſhops and Clergy, that for his ſake were in "Priſon at *Chalcedon*, whom he commends for their undaunted Beha-"viour under Suff rings, beſeeching them ſtill to maintain a Greatneſs "and Preſence of Mind ſuitable to the Miſeries they endured; and in the

midſt

'midst of all to concern themselves for the Good of the Church, assuring 'them that though their Care and Study herein might want success, it 'should not want its Reward at the hands of God. To the same Effect 'says he, he wrote a more general Epistle to all the Bishops, Presbyters 'and Deacons that were imprisoned upon this Account, that their Suf- 'ferings had made them renown'd and eminent thro' the whole World; 'which should not be in vain, that if their Sufferings were so great, what 'wou'd be their Reward? That they should rejoice and be glad, and quit 'themselves like Men, and remember how many their exemplary Courage 'and Constancy had arm'd with Patience, how many that were wavering 'it had confirm'd, and reviv'd their drooping Spirits, the importance of it 'reaching beyond those who had the happiness to behold it; and that 'they should sustain them by a continual Reflexion upon that Apostolical 'Truth, *That the Sufferings of this present time, are not worthy to be com- 'pared with the Glory which shall be revealed in us.* *Ibid.* *Ib. p. 516*

Thus wrote St. *Chrysostom* to the suffering Bishops and Clergy, who refused to comply with the Imperial Edicts about Communion with *Arsacius*, *Atticus*, &c.

Which is a demonstration that their Separation (which was the cause of all their Sufferings) was not so contrary to the Spirit of St. *Chrysostom*. If it had, instead of applauding and commending their Courage and *undaunted Behaviour under Sufferings*, which he tells them *had made them renowned and eminent through the World, which should not be in vain, beseeching them still to maintain a Greatness and Presence of Mind, suitable to the Miseries they endured*; instead of this, I say, he would have blamed and reproved them, as obstinate, wilfull Fools, that were fond of Trouble, and did needlessly run themselves into the Fire, as *Evil Doers*, and therefore inglorious Sufferers, perverse, stubborn, *unsatisfied Persons*, and *Schismatical* Violaters of the Peace of the Church: So that though St. *Chrysostom* before his Banishment might advise his Friends against Sufferings for his sake, and a Separation from, and refusing Communion with his usurping Successors, as not prudential; yet 'tis plain, that he did not think or condemn it as sinful.

But before I dismiss what the Authour of the *Greek Manuscript* says about St. *Chrysostom*, and his usurping Successors, I must beg leave to observe what a *notorious Falsehood* he is guilty of in affirming (p. 4.) *That* Severianus, *Bishop of* Gabala, *and* Acacius, *Bishop of* Berrhea, (*or rather* Beroea,) *who were the chief Authors of all the calamities that befell* Chrysostom, *being afterwards call'd in question by Pope* Innocent, *were neither deposed nor reprehended by him; the Pope leaving their Punishment to God.*

For Answer to this I must refer my Reader to the aforesaid Historian, (for I resolve to write or deliver nothing in this weighty and important Case without good Authority,) who tells us, *p.* 531. 'That Pope *Inno- 'cent* giving over all hopes of doing good by fair Means, resolved to pro- 'ceed to Censures, and to separate both the Emperour and his Lady 'from all Christian Communion, which he did by a Letter to *Arcadius*, *Ib. p. 532* 'wherein amongst other things he tells him, That he had abrogated *Ar- 'sacius* his Authority, though dead and gone, (and if so, then the Ordi- nations of those Presbyters, Bishops, and Deacons, who were ordained

by

by him, notwithſtanding what our *Greek Author* ſays, p. 2.) 'whoſe 'Name he forbad to be entred into the holy Diptychs, together with all 'the Biſhops that had communicated with him, of which number were 'Severian and *Acacius*. And for *Theophilus*, beſides his Depoſition, he ad- 'ded his Excommunication, and utter Alienation from the Chriſtian 'Religion.

Now let the Reader obſerve, That *Severianus* and *Acacius* ſtood upon the ſame Foot with *Theophilus*, who were jointly St. *Chryſoſtom's* Proſecutors and Judges, whom *Arcadius* in his Anſwer to Pope *Innocent's* Letter, calls *thoſe wretched Biſhops*, at whoſe door, he ſays, the Guilt
Ibid. 'muſt lie, who under pretence of Eccleſiaſtical Canons had done it, 'and taken the blame upon their own Heads, whoſe unjuſt Suggeſtions 'he confeſſes he had aſſented to. Wherein eſpecially he refers to *Aca-*
Ib. p. 495. *cius*, who was one of thoſe that adviſed him to depoſe and baniſh *Chry-* *ſoſtom*, telling him that it ſhould *lie at their door*, and that they were
Ibid. *ready to anſwer it with the peril of their Heads.*

Now that *Severian* and *Acacius* being guilty of the ſame Crimes were under the ſame Cenſure with *Theophilus*, may be ſtrongly preſumed from a Paſſage in *Arcadius's* Anſwer to Pope *Innocent's* Letter, *viz.* 'That for *Acacius*, *Severian*, *Theophilus*, and the reſt, they ſhould be 'brought to Account.——— Which is a plain Indication, that Pope *Innocent* had ſignified to the Emperour in his Letters, that he had pronounced Cenſures upon them, and deſired him to take care that they might not be *Bruta Fulmina*, but executed *cum effectu* upon them; which *Arcadius* ſeems to promiſe, telling him, *they ſhould be brought to account.*

And thus I think it is ſufficiently evident what a *faithfull*, or rather *falſe* Hiſtorian, and diſingenuous Prevaricator, the Author of the *Greek Manuſcript* is; and how ignorantly or maliciouſly the *Tranſlator* of it has attempted to impoſe upon the World, by recommending it as a *moſt excellent*, *worthy Piece*, which would not fail either to ſilence or ſatisfie *thoſe unſatisfied Perſons of the Church of* England, as he calls them.

What has been already ſaid may be enough to ſatisfie the Reader touching the *Worth* and the *Truth* too of this *Excellent Piece*, from whence he may take his Meaſures how to judge of the reſt. And perhaps it will not be worth while, being equally unprofitable and offenſive, to rake any farther in this *Kennel*, or dig any longer in this noiſome *Dunghill*, (which the briſker, quick-ſighted Academicks at *Oxford* thought not fit heretofore to ſtir too much, leſt it ſhould ſtink,) being not able to promiſe our ſelves what *Virgil* did *de Stercore Ennii*.

And I cannot but admire, that ſo learned and ingenious a Man as Dr. *Raſe* is vogued to be, ſhould ſuffer ſuch a futilous, noiſome Piece, ſuch a Farce of Lies and notorious Falſhoods, to paſs under his *Imprimatur*.

But I forget that he is a *young Licenſer*, and perhaps ſo good natur'd to his Friend, like the celebrated Mr. *Fraſier*, as, Right or Wrong, it be but *well deſigned*, to license without Reading, as the *Bankers* in *Lombard-ſtreet* take Money by Content upon the Credit of their Correſpondents.

FINIS.

ST. DAVID'S LIBRARY